

REMARKS

An interview with the Examiner was conducted on May 1, 2008 and the claims are amended in view of the interview.

Claims 1-9, 19-27, 37, 41, 43 and 45 are elected and pending.

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, and thus, the claims remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter is added.

35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 3-6, 21-24 and 39-42 are rejected for indefiniteness, because allegedly it is unclear why a digital signature needs to be received for such a program, when the receiving step does not recite receipt of a format receiving step. However, the language of claim 3 particularly points out and distinctly claims for one skilled in the art that a digital signature for a program is received by the intermediary computer. Lack of claim language of whether the program is transmitted does not render the claim indefinite, because if the program is transmitted, the digital signature can be used to detect alteration, and if the program is not transmitted, the digital signature can still be used by the recipient to confirm use of a correct program. Page 25, lines 27-23 expressly describes the format reverse-conversion program may not be sent from the TC server E to the RSP server 7, and that it can be verified whether the format reverse-conversion program to be executed in the TC server F is the format reverse-conversion program contemplated by the transmission source. Thus, this rejection is traversed.

Claims 3-6, 21-24, 39-41 and 42 are rejected, because allegedly these claims recite a third digital signature, and it is unclear if there is a second digital signature involved, since only a first digital signature is claimed in the claims in which they are dependent on.

In view of the interview, the claims under the indefiniteness rejections are amended to improve form by providing "wherein a ~~third~~second digital signature is received for at least said format reverse-conversion program ~~is received in said receiving~~."

Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections is respectfully requested.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claim 1 is rejected as being unpatentable over Micali and Schneier. The Office Action page 5, line 1, asserts the claimed "format conversion" is hashing in Micali. However, this is

technically incorrect, because the phrase "format conversion" should be interpreted in connection with the claim language "a format reverse-conversion program for performing reverse conversion of the format conversion." If the format conversion would be hashing, the reverse conversion of the hashing must be defined by Micali. Incidentally, as also evidenced by Schneier, hashing is normally a one-way hashing (Micali column 6, line 67), namely, the reverse conversion of the hashing cannot be carried out. Schneier refers to the one way hashing function, which means the original value cannot be obtained from the hash value. Therefore, the reverse conversion of the hashing cannot be defined, and the Office Action interpretation of "format conversion" corresponding to "hashing" of Micali is not appropriate.

Further, in view of the interview with the Examiner, the independent claims are amended to provide "performing system and/or regulation format conversion corresponding to a destination of said first data, for said first data received in said receiving to generate second data." For example, the present application page 1, line 30 to page 2, line 4; and page 8, lines 1-8, support the claim amendments.

The Office Action relies upon Micali column 6, line 64-65, "[P01] sends to Bob information enabling him to retrieve Alice's message." The claimed invention provides, for example, "performing system and/or regulation format conversion corresponding to a destination of said first data, for said first data received in said receiving to generate second data; ... and "sending at least the encrypted second data, a format reverse-conversion program for performing reverse conversion of the format conversion, and said first digital signature to said second computer associated with said destination," so that by performing "system and/or regulation format conversion" and "sending ... a format reverse-conversion program for performing reverse conversion of the format conversion," a destination can verify a transmission source when the original document has been legitimately changed on the way. A prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established based upon Micali and Schneier, because there is no evidence expressly or implicitly that one skilled in the art would combine Micali and Schneier's encrypted/decryption and digital signing methods to achieve the claimed "system and/or regulation format conversion" and "sending ... a format reverse-conversion program for performing reverse conversion of the format conversion" as well as the recited encryption/decryption and digital signing, to provide the benefit of accommodating authorized changes to documents during transmission. It is understood, the prior art rejections are now overcome, and the claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/725,572

Docket No.: 1538.1043

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependences from the independent claims.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ May 8, 2008 _____

By: _____

Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501